



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 March 2021

by D Szymanski BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22nd March 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/T3725/D/20/3262897

1 Edmondes Close, Warwick CV34 5TX

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr & Mrs R McDonough against the decision of Warwick District Council.
 - The application Ref W/20/0974, dated 16 June 2020, was refused by notice dated 24 August 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as Amendment to raise rear roof area & realign windows. Retrospective application following W19/1238, New drawing 1848/4A & 5A. Drawings 1848/4 & 5 attached for reference.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. At my visit the roof had been substantially constructed. I have considered the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene.

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises one of a pair of bungalows on a prominent corner plot at the junction of Edmondes Close, Neville Grove and the access to a garaging area. Edmondes Close and Neville Grove is characterised by gable roof bungalows and gable fronted houses of similar shapes, colour frontage brickwork, configurations and appearance. The limited additions to surrounding properties I saw at my visit were subservient to the host properties and were in a similar brickwork. This results in a highly regular, uniform, and distinctive street scene.
5. The application seeks permission for a new higher pitched roof on a pre-existing flat roofed projection, to that previously approved by the Council under Ref W/19/1238. The pre-existing projection occupies a significant proportion of the plot. The appeal development is markedly taller than the previously approved development, being only marginally lower than the main dwelling.

6. The roof ridge of the development is longer than that on the main dwelling and as a consequence of the steeper pitch and increased height, it competes with and is not subservient to the main dwelling or in keeping with the appearance of similar bungalows nearby. The steeper pitch is noticeably at odds with that of the shallower roof on the main dwelling. It forms a somewhat dominant and prominently sited element, that is significantly harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and with the shape, uniformity and rhythm of semi-detached bungalows in the street scene.
7. The pre-existing brickwork may have been of limited quality but there is no substantive evidence it could not have been satisfactorily repaired or replaced. The height, position, extent and prominence of the rendering, projecting significantly from the sidewall of the main dwellinghouse, is highly prominent in the street scene, highlighting the height and scale of the roof. Its appearance is incongruent and jarring, being significantly and harmfully at odds with the red brickwork of the appeal site and that which is an overriding positive and unifying characteristic of the street scene. However, even if I were to accept the appellants view that this rendering does not require planning permission, this would not mitigate the other harm from the development I have set out above.
8. For the reasons set out above the development is significantly harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene. Therefore, it conflicts with Policy BE1 of the Warwick District Local Plan (2017) which expects development exhibits good design that harmonises with the established character and respects surrounding buildings in terms of scale, height and form. It conflicts with the advice set out within section 8 of the Residential Design Guide (2018) which expects extensions should be subservient to the host dwelling. It would also conflict with paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019) (the Framework) which expects development to add to the overall quality of the area and be sympathetic to local character.

Other Matters

9. The Council's ecological adviser has suggested a condition in respect of the provision of a bat box. The bat box would be a small benefit which would not mitigate or outweigh the significant harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the harm to the street scene set out above.
10. I note the suggestion from the appellants that the Council has not worked proactively with them. However, this does not alter my conclusions which are based on the planning merits of the development only.

Conclusion

11. The development harms the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene in conflict with the development plan and the Framework taken as a whole. There are no material considerations that indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, for the reasons given, the appeal should not succeed.

Dan Szymanski

INSPECTOR